

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,282	03/24/2000	Selda Gunsel	42053.6USPT	2884
24238 JENKENS &	7590 07/26/200 & GILCHRIST, A P	2 ROFESSIONAL CORPORATION	EXAMINER	
I 100 LOUISI SUITE 1800		BERNATZ, KEVIN M		
HOUSTON,	TX 77002-5214	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1773 DATE MAILED: 07/26/2002	14	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,				AS-14			
•	Application I	lo.	Applicant(s)				
	09/534,282		GUNSEL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
	Kevin M Bern		1773				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap				Jaress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturent or period by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	136(a). In no event, ply within the statutory d will apply and will ex	nowever, may a reply be time minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from ton to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)□ T	This action is no	n-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr		deration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	:	Interview Summa Notice of Informa Other:	ry (PTO-413) Paper I I Patent Application (No(s). <u>14</u> . PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 2, 11 – 14 and 23 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirniman et al. ('600 B1) in view of Venier et al. ('023), Venier, Casserly and Gunsel (IDS reference titled "Tris (2-Octyldodecyl)Cyclopentane, a Low Volatility, Wide Liquid-Range, Hydrocarbon Fluid") and Babb et al. ('547). Hereafter, this combination of references will be referred to as SVVB.

The above rejection is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 4 of the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2002 (Paper No. 12).

3. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SVVB as applied above, and further in view of Patsidis et al. ('351).

The above rejection is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 5 of the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2002 (Paper No. 12).

Art Unit: 1773

4. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SVVB as applied above, and further in view of Venier and Casserly (IDS reference from Symposium on the Chem. of Lubricants).

The above rejection is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 6 of the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2002 (Paper No. 12).

5. Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SVVB as applied above, and further in view of Sanechika et al. ('593) and Ng ('216).

The above rejection is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 7 of the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2002 (Paper No. 12).

6. Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SVVB as applied above, and further in view of Tsuchiya et al. ('516) and Hayashi ('983).

The above rejection is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in Paragraph No. 8 of the Office Action mailed on February 7, 2002 (Paper No. 12).

Response to Arguments

7. The rejection of claims 1 - 37 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) – SVVB either alone or in vi w of various ref rences

Art Unit: 1773

Applicant(s) argue(s) that the specification discloses sufficient evidence of unexpected results over the prior art that the present claims are distinguished from the references of record. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As indicated in the attached interview summary, the examiner notes that the argument of unexpected results is convincing for the single embodiment show in Table II. However, as discussed in the aforementioned interview, the claims must be commensurate in scope with the showing of unexpected results. Currently, the only showing of unexpected results is for ~ 0.1 wt% Pennzane X-2000 versus 0.1 wt% Z-DOL. It is uncertain from the specification what MW Z-DOL and/or Pennzane is used. Should applicants desire to pursue a showing of unexpected results commensurate in scope with the claims as written, comparison between cyclopentane, cyclopentene and cyclopentadiene versus Z-DOL of comparable (a) MW, (b) viscosity and (c) chain length would be required. For a range in MW, viscosity or chain length, a comparison at each end point to be claimed would be required. The examiner reminds applicants that support for these endpoints must be found in the present disclosure or may be added in a Continuation-in-Part (CiP) application based on the current application.

For each species that applicants wish to claim, at least one embodiment representative of the species must also be shown to produce unexpected results when compared to a Z-DOL of similar MW, viscosity and/or chain length (whichever applicants feel is the closest prior art). For very broad species where the properties may not be expected to be uniform through-out the substituents groups, additional comparison would be required. Applicants are invited to contact the examiner if any

Art Unit: 1773

questions arise with regard to what would be a sufficient comparison versus the prior art.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M Bernatz whose telephone number is (703) 308-1737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on (703) 308-2367. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

KMB

July 24, 2002

STEVAN A. REŠAN

PRIMARY EXAMINER